



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,261	12/22/2003	Fung-Jou Chen	KCX-769 (19909)	4458
22827 7590 04/23/2007 DORITY & MANNING, P.A. POST OFFICE BOX 1449 GREENVILLE, SC 29602-1449			EXAMINER KARLS, SHAY LYNN	
			ART UNIT 1744	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS			04/23/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

4

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/743,261	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Shay L. Karls	<b>Art Unit</b> 1744	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 and 37-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 31-35 and 37-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 June 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**Claims 1-2, 5, 9, 11-12, 14, 31-32, 37-38, 40-41 and 43 are rejected under 35**

**U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vosbikian et al. (USPN 2678458).**

With regards to claim 1, Vosbikian teaches a handle (not labeled but is inserted into reference number 9) and a mop head (7, 8) having a handle attachment surface (9), wherein the handle is attached to the handle attachment surface. There is a disposable wipe (1, 2) attached to the mop head, wherein the wipe is configured to be removed from the mop head by a user of the mop. It is considered to be disposable since, after use, it can be removed from the head and thrown away. The wipe engages a cleaning surface and removes unwanted material from the

Art Unit: 1744

surface to be cleaned. There is further a squeegee blade (4, 5) attached to the ends of the wipe, wherein the blade removed excess fluid from the surface to be cleaned.

With regards to claim 2, the wipe is directly attached to the handle attachment surface of the mop head (figure 1 and 2) since the wipe is considered to include elements 1 and 2.

With regards to claim 5, the squeegee blade is made from a rubber material (col. 2, lines 11-17).

With regards to claim 9, the squeegee blade and the wipe are both capable of being used simultaneously when cleaning the surface to be cleaned. The mop could be used so that long vertical side of the wipe is parallel with the cleaning surface, thus causing the blade to contact the cleaning surface at the same time. Not shown but clearly could be operated in this manner.

With regards to claims 11 and 12, the wipe can be used in dry or wet form. When used dry, the wipe could be used to absorb liquids that might have been spilled on the cleaning surface. When used wet, the cleaning surface can be cleaned using a cleaning solution as shown in figure 2.

With regards to claim 14, the squeegee blade is deformable as shown in figure 2.

With regards to claim 31, Vosbikian teaches a cleaning apparatus for use with a tool (7, 8, 9). The apparatus comprises a disposable wipe (1, 2) attached to the tool, wherein the wipe is configured to be removed from the tool by a user of the mop. It is considered to be disposable since, after use, it can be removed from the head and thrown away. The wipe engages a cleaning surface and removes unwanted material from the surface to be cleaned. There is further a squeegee blade (4, 5) attached to the ends of the wipe, wherein the blade removed excess fluid from the surface to be cleaned.

Art Unit: 1744

With regards to claim 32, the squeegee blade is made from a rubber material (col. 2, lines 11-17).

With regards to claim 37, the blade comprises a tip that does not contact the wipe when the apparatus is used to clean the surface to be cleaned. The tip extends away from the wipe and therefore will never contacts the wipe.

With regards to claim 38, the squeegee blade and the wipe are both capable of being used simultaneously when cleaning the surface to be cleaned. The mop could be used so that long vertical side of the wipe is in perpendicular contact with the cleaning surface, thus causing the blade to contact the cleaning surface at the same time.

With regards to claims 40 and 41, the wipe can be used in dry or wet form. When used dry, the wipe could be used to absorb liquids that might have been spilled on the cleaning surface. When used wet, the cleaning surface can be cleaned using a cleaning solution as shown in figure 2.

With regards to claim 43, the squeegee blade is deformable as shown in figure 2.

**Claims 1, 8-9, 11-12, 14, 31, 35, 37-38, 40-41 and 44 are rejected under 35**

**U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Graham (USPN 4455705).**

With regards to claim 1, Graham teaches a handle (element 36 facilitates attachment of elongated handle, col. 4, lines 3-7) and a mop head (30) having a handle attachment surface (25, 36), wherein the handle is attached to the handle attachment surface. There is a disposable wipe (16, 17) attached to the mop head, wherein the wipe is configured to be removed from the mop head by a user of the mop (figure 5 shows it being removed). It is considered to be disposable since, after use, it can be removed from the head and thrown away. The wipe engages a cleaning

Art Unit: 1744

surface and removes unwanted material from the surface to be cleaned. There is further a squeegee blade (10, 40) attached to an end of the wipe, wherein the blade removed excess fluid from the surface to be cleaned.

With regards to claim 8, the squeegee blade is attached to the wipe by mechanical fasteners (20).

With regards to claim 9, the squeegee blade and the wipe are both capable of being used simultaneously when cleaning the surface to be cleaned. The mop could be used so that long vertical side of the wipe is in perpendicular contact with the cleaning surface, thus causing the blade to contact the cleaning surface at the same time (as shown in figure 3; could be used to clean the edge of a table or such)

With regards to claims 11 and 12, the wipe can be used in dry or wet form. When used dry, the wipe could be used to absorb liquids that might have been spilled on the cleaning surface or can be used abrasively to remove scuffs on the cleaning surface. When used wet, the wipe absorbs cleaning solution and thus helps to clean the cleaning surface.

With regards to claim 14, the squeegee blade of Graham is deformable since it is capable of bending. While the material used is not disclosed, the definition of a squeegee according to Merriam-Webster's Dictionary, 10<sup>th</sup> Edition is "a blade of leather or rubber set on a handle" and therefore, both leather and rubber are deformable.

With regards to claim 31, Graham teaches a cleaning apparatus for use with a tool (25, 30). The apparatus comprises a disposable wipe (16, 17) attached to the tool, wherein the wipe is configured to be removed from the tool by a user of the mop. It is considered to be disposable since, after use, it can be removed from the head and thrown away. The wipe engages a cleaning

Art Unit: 1744

surface and removes unwanted material from the surface to be cleaned. There is further a squeegee blade (10, 40) attached to an end of the wipe, wherein the blade removed excess fluid from the surface to be cleaned.

With regards to claims 35 and 44, the squeegee blade is attached to the wipe by mechanical fasteners (20).

With regards to claim 37, the blade comprises a tip that does not contact the wipe when the apparatus is used to clean the surface to be cleaned. The tip extends away from the wipe and therefore will never contact the wipe.

With regards to claim 38, the squeegee blade and the wipe are both capable of being used simultaneously when cleaning the surface to be cleaned. The mop could be used so that long vertical side of the wipe is in perpendicular contact with the cleaning surface, thus causing the blade to contact the cleaning surface at the same time (as shown in figure 3).

With regards to claims 40 and 41, the wipe can be used in dry or wet form. When used dry, the wipe could be used to absorb liquids that might have been spilled on the cleaning surface or can be used abrasively to remove scuffs on the cleaning surface. When used wet, the wipe absorbs cleaning solution and thus helps to clean the cleaning surface.

**Claims 1-2, 5-6, 8, 11-12, 14, 31-33, 35, 37, 40-41 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Leland (USPN 3526918).**

With regards to claim 1, Leland teaches a handle (28) and a mop head (20) having a handle attachment surface (18), wherein the handle is attached to the handle attachment surface. There is a disposable wipe (12) attached to the mop head, wherein the wipe is configured to be removed from the mop head by a user of the mop. It is considered to be disposable since, after

Art Unit: 1744

use, it can be removed from the head and thrown away. The wipe engages a cleaning surface and removes unwanted material from the surface to be cleaned. There is further a squeegee blade (14, 16) attached to an upper end of the wipe (figure 3), wherein the blade removed excess fluid from the surface to be cleaned.

With regards to claim 2, the wipe is directly attached to the handle attachment surface of the mop head (figure 3 shows the handle extending from the wipe).

With regards to claim 5, the squeegee blade is made from rubber (col. 2, lines 56-64).

With regards to claim 6, the squeegee blade has a pair of ends that are curved in towards one another (figures 2 and 3 show that the short sides of the blade are curved in towards the middle).

With regards to claim 8, the squeegee blade is attached to the wipe by an adhesive (col. 2, lines 44-48).

With regards to claims 11 and 12, the wipe can be used in dry or wet form. When used dry, the wipe could be used to absorb liquids that might have been spilled on the cleaning surface or can be used abrasively to remove scuffs on the cleaning surface. When used wet, the wipe absorbs cleaning solution and thus helps to clean the cleaning surface.

With regards to claim 14, the squeegee blade is deformable since it is made from a resilient material such as rubber (col. 2, lines 56-65).

With regards to claim 31, Leland teaches a cleaning apparatus for use with a tool (18, 20). The apparatus comprises a disposable wipe (12) attached to the tool, wherein the wipe is configured to be removed from the tool by a user of the mop. It is considered to be disposable since, after use, it can be removed from the head and thrown away. The wipe engages a cleaning



Art Unit: 1744

surface and removes unwanted material from the surface to be cleaned. There is further a squeegee blade (14, 16) attached to the upper end of the wipe, wherein the blade removed excess fluid from the surface to be cleaned.

With regards to claim 32, the squeegee blade is made from rubber (col. 2, lines 56-64).

With regards to claim 33, the squeegee blade has a pair of ends that are curved in towards one another (figures 2 and 3 show that the short sides of the blade are curved in towards the middle).

With regards to claims 35, the squeegee blade is attached to the wipe by an adhesive (col. 2, lines 44-48).

With regards to claim 37, the blade comprises a tip that does not contact the wipe when the apparatus is used to clean the surface to be cleaned. The tip extends away from the wipe and therefore will never contacts the wipe.

With regards to claims 40 and 41, the wipe can be used in dry or wet form. When used dry, the wipe could be used to absorb liquids that might have been spilled on the cleaning surface or can be used abrasively to remove scuffs on the cleaning surface. When used wet, the wipe absorbs cleaning solution and thus helps to clean the cleaning surface.

With regards to claim 43, the squeegee blade is deformable since it is made from a resilient material such as rubber (col. 2, lines 56-65).

**Claims 1-2, 5, 9, 11-12, 14, 31-32, 37-38, 40-41 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pfeifer (DE 2643717).**

With regards to claim 1, Pfeifer teaches a handle (3) and a mop head (1) having a handle attachment surface (surface with element 2 connects to), wherein the handle is attached to the

Art Unit: 1744

handle attachment surface. There is a disposable wipe (4) attached to the mop head, wherein the wipe is configured to be removed from the mop head by a user of the mop. It is considered to be disposable since, after use, it can be removed from the head and thrown away. The wipe engages a cleaning surface and removes unwanted material from the surface to be cleaned. There is further a squeegee blade (5) attached to a top end of the wipe (figure 1 and 2), wherein the blade removed excess fluid from the surface to be cleaned.

With regards to claim 2, the wipe is attached to the handle attachment surface of the mop head (figure 2).

With regards to claim 5, the squeegee blade is made from rubber (abstract).

With regards to claim 9, the wipe and blade are capable of being used simultaneously when cleaning the surface to be cleaned since the major part of the wipe and the blade are located on the same plane.

With regards to claims 11 and 12, the wipe can be used in dry or wet form. When used dry, the wipe could be used to absorb liquids that might have been spilled on the cleaning surface or can be used abrasively to remove scuffs on the cleaning surface. When used wet, the wipe absorbs cleaning solution and thus helps to clean the cleaning surface.

With regards to claim 14, the squeegee blade is deformable since it is made from a resilient material such as rubber (abstract).

With regards to claim 31, Pfeifer teaches a cleaning apparatus for use with a tool (1, 2, 3). The apparatus comprises a disposable wipe (4) attached to the tool, wherein the wipe is configured to be removed from the tool by a user of the mop. It is considered to be disposable since, after use, it can be removed from the head and thrown away. The wipe engages a cleaning

Art Unit: 1744

surface and removes unwanted material from the surface to be cleaned. There is further a squeegee blade (5) attached to the top end of the wipe (figure 1 and 2), wherein the blade removed excess fluid from the surface to be cleaned.

With regards to claim 32, the squeegee blade is made from rubber (abstract).

With regards to claim 37, the blade comprises a tip that does not contact the wipe when the apparatus is used to clean the surface to be cleaned. The tip extends away from the wipe and therefore will never contacts the wipe.

With regards to claim 38, the wipe and blade are capable of being used simultaneously when cleaning the surface to be cleaned since the major part of the wipe and the blade are located on the same plane.

With regards to claims 40 and 41, the wipe can be used in dry or wet form. When used dry, the wipe could be used to absorb liquids that might have been spilled on the cleaning surface or can be used abrasively to remove scuffs on the cleaning surface. When used wet, the wipe absorbs cleaning solution and thus helps to clean the cleaning surface.

With regards to claim 43, the squeegee blade is deformable since it is made from a resilient material such as rubber (abstract).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1744

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

**Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pfeifer ('717).**

Pfeifer teaches all the essential elements of the claimed invention including that one end of the wipe is attached to the handle attachment surface of the mop head, the wipe then wraps around a portion of the mop head such that the opposite end of the disposable wipe is also attached to the handle attachment surface of the mop head (claim 4). Pfeifer however fails to teach that the squeegee blade is located on the handle attachment surface (claims 3 and 4). In the figures, it is shown that the blade is located on the bottom portion of the mop head and not on the handle attachment surface. However, it is known in the art to use mop heads of various sizes for different jobs. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a smaller mop head with the wipe of Pfeifer since the blade would then be capable of being on the handle attachment surface because the wipe would wrap further around the mop head.

**Claims 5 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham ('705) or Vosbikian ('458) both in view of Leland ('918).**

Graham or Vosbikian teach all the essential elements of the claimed invention however fail to teach that the squeegee blade is made from a rubber, polyolefin plastic, deformable plastic, elastomer or foam (claims 5 and 32). Leland teaches a squeegee blade made from a rubber material (col. 2, lines 56-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Graham or Vosbikian so that their blades are made from a rubber material as taught by Leland since rubber will allow the blades to conform two dimensionally to the curvatures of the surface being cleaned (col. 2, lines 60-63), thus removing any excess fluid.

**Claims 7 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham ('705), Vosbikian ('458), Leland ('918) or Pfeifer ('717) all in view of Anderson (USPN 2155462).**

Graham, Vosbikian, Leland or Pfeifer teach all the essential elements of the claimed invention however fail to teach that the squeegee blade has a plurality of ribbed features located thereon (claims 7 and 34). Anderson teaches a combination tool with a sponge and a squeegee blade (figure 2). The squeegee blade has ribs on the outer surface (8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the outer surface of the squeegee blades of Graham, Vosbikian, Leland or Pfeifer with a ribbed surface as taught by Anderson since the ribbed surface increases the number of wiping edges on the blade and therefore increases the efficiency of removing moisture from the surface to be cleaned (col. 2, lines 15-20).

**Claims 10 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pfeifer ('717) all in view of Brown et al. (USPN 6550639).**

Art Unit: 1744

Pfeifer teaches all the essential elements of the claimed invention however fails to teach that the wipe is an electrostatically treated web. Brown teaches a cleaning sheet that is electrostatically charged (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the wipe of Pfeifer so that is it electrostatically charged as taught by Brown since electrostatic charge enhances the ability of the cleaning sheet to attract, collect, trap and retain debris during the cleaning process (col. 4, lines 56-59).

**Claims 13 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham ('705), Vosbikian ('458), Leland ('918) or Pfeifer ('717) all in view of Kosaka et al. (USPN 6608118).**

Graham, Vosbikian, Leland or Pfeifer teach all the essential elements of the claimed invention however fail to teach that a melamine based foam attached to the squeegee blade. Kosaka teaches a wiper comprising a melamine-molded foam (col. 1, lines 9-12, lines 34-36; col. 2, lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the blades of Graham, Vosbikian, Leland or Pfeifer with a melamine based foam as taught by Kosaka since wipers or blades with the melamine molded foam attached show an excellent dirt-removing ability without damaging the surface to be washed, and have an excellent durability (col. 2, lines 1-5).

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 1/29/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that Vosbikian fails to teach a wipe since a block of sponge material is not a wipe. Dictionary.com teaches that wipe is a piece of absorbent material used for wiping.

Art Unit: 1744

A sponge can be considered a wipe then because it is made from an absorbent material that is used to mop up and absorb liquids.

The applicant also argues that the block of sponge material is not attached directly to the handle attachment surface, however the entire device: sponge and flexible backing are both considered to be the wipe and therefore, the sponge and flexible backing are both directly connected to the handle attachment surface.

The applicant argues that the reference fails to teach the squeegee and wipe being used together. While the reference may not show them being used simultaneously, it is clear that the head can be positioned in any manner (whether or not it is shown in the figures). Therefore, the mop head is capable of being used with the long vertical edge of the sponge positioned parallel to the surface being cleaned (wherein the bottom of the sponge would then be perpendicular to the surface).

The applicant argues that the cleaning pad of Graham is not attached to the squeegee blade. The examiner would like to point out that the squeegee blade could be comprised of both elements 40 and 10, since the applicant does not disclose any structural limitations of the blade. Even though the reference states that element 10 is an applicator head it is clear that it could be considered to be part of the blade since there is nothing in the claim language that prevents it from reading on the limitations. Thus, since element 10 is considered to be part of the squeegee, the wipe is considered to be attached to the blade by means of fasteners (20).

The applicant also argues that Graham fails to teach a wipe. Graham teaches a sponge like material, which as stated above can be considered a wipe since it is an absorbent material used for wiping.

Art Unit: 1744

The applicant also argues that the reference fails to teach the squeegee and wipe being used together. Figure 3 shows the positioning of the device wherein both the wipe and squeegee could be used at the same time.

The applicant argues that reference number 13 in Leland is directed toward an internal inner surface and not the actual pad member. The examiner agrees with this, and it is clear that the examiner used the incorrect reference number when describing the pad member of Leland. The office action has been changed so that reference number 12 is used to describe the pad member.

The applicant also argues that Leland fails to teach a handle attachment surface. The applicant states that the reference refers to element 18 as a handle and not a handle attachment surface in the specification. While the specification refers to element 18 as a handle, it is clearly capable that element 18 is also a handle attachment surface since it is used when attaching handle 28. Reference number 18 has the same structural limitations of the claimed handle attachment surface and therefore is clearly capable of performing the same function.

The applicant also argues that Leland fails to teach a wipe. Leland teaches a sponge like material, which as stated above can be considered a wipe since it is an absorbent material used for wiping.

The applicant further argues that Pfeifer fails to teach a squeegee blade attached to a top end of the wipe. The applicant states that the blade is embedded into the wiping cloth and contacts both sides of the cloth. While it appears from the pictures that the squeegee is embedded within cloth, it is clear that the blade is located at a top portion of the wipe. Whether



Art Unit: 1744

or not the blade is embedded within the cloth does not take away from the actual location of the blade. The blade is still located at the top (upper) portion of the cloth as shown in the figures.

The applicant further argues that there is no motivation to use the wipe of Pfeifer on a smaller mop head. The applicant does not claim the size of the mop head in the claims with relation to the size of the wipe, therefore while Pfeifer teaches using a certain size, it is known to one of skill in the art to use various sized mop heads for different jobs. Thus, using a smaller mop head with the wipe of Pfeifer would allow the user to clean smaller areas such as hard to reach areas. This would not render the invention inoperative since there are no limitations as to what the proper ratio of sizing should be for the mop head and the wipe.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Art Unit: 1744

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shay L. Karls whose telephone number is 571-272-1268. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00-4:30 M-Th, alternating F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gladys Corcoran can be reached on 571-272-1214. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
Shay L Karls  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1744

  
GLADYS JP CORCORAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER